UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Sketches

By ZONA GALE

Two Documents on the Outlawry of War

By WILLIAM E. BORAH

and

S. O. LEVINSON

Items from a Traveler's Note-Book

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

VOLUME XCIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, April 3, 1924

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Curtis W. Reese
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Robert B. Whitaker
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) _____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 71
Sketches.—ZONA GALE 73
Jottings.—J. H. H. 75
Items from a Traveler's Note-Book.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 76

ARTICLES—

The Outlawry of War:
Letter to *Christian Century*.—WILLIAM E. BORAH 78
Letter to J. C. Maxwell Garnett.—S. O. LEVINSON 78
Gandhi's Letter on His Release from Prison.. 81

POETRY—

Poem.—*T. L. Vaswani*..... 71
The Sickle.—LESLIE CLARE MANCHESTER..... 83

CORRESPONDENCE—

A Letter from Japan.—TRACY STRONG..... 82
The Liberal Faith Not Controversial.—HARRY FOSTER BURNS 83

THE FIELD—

The Other France.—*Romain Rolland*..... 83
Birthdays in April of Political Prisoners..... 84

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCIII THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1924 NUMBER 5

Jesus nailed upon the Cross!
Krishna by the arrow struck!
Socrates drinking the hemlock cup!
Bruno and St. Joan of Arc
Burnt by "priests of God" to death!
Hussain killed at Kerbala!
Tilak dying in Freedom's Fight!
Gentle Gandhi jailed for truth!
Can th' Earth-Spirit cruel be?
All along the Path of Life
Strewn with trag'dies of the Soul
Lies the fragrance of Thy Love!

Novayuga. —*T. L. Vaswani.*

There are two men in this country whom we would like to see president. One is Senator Borah, of Idaho. It seems to be "on the cards" that Mr. Coolidge is to be renominated at the forthcoming Republican convention. But if the President loses public confidence as rapidly in the next few months as he has in the last few weeks, we do not see how the G. O. P. can name him, unless the Party is ready to commit suicide for the sake of consistency. If there comes no radical change in the situation, it strikes us that what the Republicans will be looking for in June is a Moses to lead them out of the wilderness of the western oil fields; and for this rôle Mr. Borah is cast as by decree of fate. In spite of his radicalism, the Idaho Senator's record is "regular." In intellectual and moral stature, he stands like Agamemnon among the Grecian kings. Honest, courageous, independent, eloquent, a great constitutional lawyer, a statesman of vast constructive capacity, a profound student of international affairs—he is a leader in the highest sense of the word, one of the few now left in the political life of America today. The other man whom we would like to see president is Senator La Follette. What a fitting crown this would be to a life of heroic devotion and creative leadership! What a personal vindication also—like that of Macdonald in England! The rumored possibility of stampeding the Republican convention for the Wisconsin Senator, as a consequence of the desperate plight of the Party, seems to us fantastic. But if Coolidge is nominated at Cleveland, and a conservative like Underwood or a nonentity like Ralston at New York, the chance for a third-party, with "Battling Bob" in the van, will be at hand. Our present mood is to hope for the worst in this oil scandal, that, through one of these two great men, the best may come.

We know of nothing more thrilling than the steady progress of the movement in this country for the Outlawry of War. UNITY espoused this cause when it was an individual venture on the part of Mr. S. O. Levinson and was thus practically unknown. Now the idea is spreading like a flood over the whole countryside of our political life and will soon become the one outstanding constructive program for the accomplishment of international peace. Especially notable is the acceptance of the Outlawry idea by the churches. As an example of this, see the recent meeting of the Council of Cities of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America held in Pittsburgh the latter part of February. At this great gathering which assembled more than 450 representatives of the denomination from all parts of the United States, the Outlawry of War idea was put in the very forefront of the work which must be done for peace. "The time has come," said Dr. Melvin P. Burns who delivered the keynote address, "for the church vigorously to attack and forever *outlaw war* as a method either of settling disputes or bettering mankind." Following this address, a motion was passed authorizing the appointment of a Committee to incorporate in resolutions the chairman's declaration of outlawry. This is but a single example of what is happening everywhere. The League of Nations is dead; the League of Nations' Court has failed to make any impression upon the American mind; the Bok Peace Plan is dying of inanition; the vitality of Outlawry, however, is increasing daily. It is the program which will settle this war question if it is ever to be settled at all.

Dr. Bénès, the Foreign Secretary of Czecho-Slovakia, has been almost universally regarded as one of the most honorable as well as one of the ablest statesmen of Europe. Recently, in signing a treaty with France, he gave solemn assurances that the document contained no secret clauses. If so, it is one of the first treaties between European powers so written. But is it so? Can Dr. Bénès's word be trusted? Light upon this question is shed by the disclosure in the March issue of *Foreign Affairs* (London), page 180, of a "circular dispatch from the French Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary to the diplomatic representatives of France in the European capitals specified in the document." This despatch, never intended of

course for publication, refers to M. Bénès's opinions, as given to the French Department of State, "on the relation between Czecho-Slovakia and Russia." It quotes Bénès as saying that "the natural sympathy which connects the Slavs of Czecho-Slovakia with the Slavs of Russia should associate them in a common policy with France. . . . It is with this idea that he (Bénès) struggled energetically at Genoa against Mr. Lloyd George who was trying to secure the recognition of the Soviets." Paralleled with this, the Editor of *Foreign Affairs* asks his readers to note the following passage from a speech by Dr. Bénès to the Parliamentary Committee for Foreign Affairs at Prague on February 6th last:

> Those critics who, in connection with the Treaty with France, reproached Czecho-Slovakia with being a vassal of France, only took into consideration those questions in which the two countries had the same interests, and passed over others, such as that of Corfu, or *that of Russia,* in which Czecho-Slovakia took rather the British standpoint.

The case is plain! Dr. Bénès is just like all the rest of his tribe. We commend again what is one of the rules of our life—Never under any circumstance accept as true the public statements of a diplomat or foreign secretary!

We thought that we had heard all the crazy yarns out of Soviet Russia—or, rather, that all these crazy yarns had been told and an era of sanity was returning. But here comes a story a little crazier than anything that has gone before—so crazy, in fact, that it has stirred us to such mirth as we have not felt for months. It appears in the Boston *Herald* for March 6th, and emanates from a newspaper man named Richard Eaton, described as a Harvard graduate. Speaking of his experiences in Russia, Mr. Eaton declares that there is a crisis in Moscow, and that "Bolshevism is tottering" (this is the 3468th time in the last five years that Bolshevism has been "tottering").

> "The crisis has been brought about," said Mr. Eaton, "through the discovery that Trotzky, after falling in love with a beautiful young woman, approached the Grand Duke Nicholas, and offered to turn over to him the powers of government in return for a passport vised for every country in Europe and a cash settlement. He explained that he wanted to leave Russia and live the rest of his life in peace with the woman he was going to make his wife. Before his proposals could be considered, the plot was discovered, and Trotzky is now in the south trying to organize the Cossack tribes in a revolt against bolshevism."

Of all the tales ever concocted about Russia, this takes the cake! Not one of the forty-nine (49) champion lies enumerated by Prof. Ross in his famous "Poison Gas" chapter in his last book, "The Russian Soviet Republic," equals it. Was there ever such a fantasy—"a beautiful young woman" (soft music, please!), the Grand Duke, Trotzky prepared to sell out his government in return for a life of peace on an isle of bliss with his beloved! This has the movies beaten a mile. And Mr. Eaton has the audacity to complain that he was arrested as a spy, and detained in prison for examination! Of course he was arrested—but not as a spy! O, no! Mr. Eaton may know about beautiful young women and Grand Dukes and Trotzky seeking peace and quiet, but he's wrong here about himself. Manifestly he was arrested not as a spy but as a lunatic, and detained not for examination but for observation. How he got loose, and is still at large, is the real mystery!

Lists of great men never tire us, but frequently amaze us. Nothing more amazing, be it said, has ever come our way than the list of "the four outstanding men of the twentieth century" prepared by Dr. M. L. Burton, President of the University of Michigan. This list enrolls Roosevelt, Edison, Ford, and Orville Wright. We know of no better way to characterize this selection than to quote the observation of the New York *World,* which speaks of "the slump of materialism that followed the great war" taking on a "serious meaning for the national life . . . when a famous educator of youth can put a Babbitt estimate on greatness." Dr. Burton's choice becomes especally significant when we remember that it originated in a desire to correct a list of the four greatest men of our time prepared by Charles H. Brent, Episcopal Bishop of Western New York. This distinguished clergyman named as his selections—Woodrow Wilson, Cardinal Mercier, Nicolai Lenin and Mahatma Gandhi. This is not a perfect list, by any means. For Wilson we would substitute Smuts or Macdonald, and for Mercier, Romain Rolland. But the selection of Lenin and Gandhi is so admirable, and the whole spirit of the Bishop's thought so fine, that we see no comparison between his work and that of President Burton. The former has considered spiritual values; the latter confesses himself an out-and-out materialist. For once the church is not discredited. The Bishop's mind, we are confident, anticipates the future, and we know that it represents the only hope of America and of the world. Only by following such men as Brent names, can our civilization be saved.

The definite and positive refusal on the part of President Coolidge to recognize at this time the independence of the Filipinos seems something like a grim joke. At a time when there are upwards of a dozen investigations being conducted by the Senate, which range from the oil scandals to an inquiry into "fake diploma mills," it would hardly seem to be fitting for the people of the United States, through the personality of their president, to assume an "I-am-holier-than-thou" attitude. A time when national officials are referred to as participating in the looting of the naval oil reserves does not seem a quite propitious one for questioning the capacity of another people for self-government. It hardly seems fair to insist that the Filipinos get along with General Wood when we would not have him as president. We do not believe that the pronouncement of President Coolidge represents the real mind and heart of the American people.

Representative George H. Tinkham of Massachusetts, gave out a statement the other day bearing upon the relative wickedness of the three great capitals, London, Paris and Washington. His conclusion is that Washington is worse than either of the other two places and he bases his opinions upon figures contained in a report recently made to Congress by the Washington Superintendent of Police. He finds that whereas the population of Washington has increased a little more than thirty-one per cent from 1910 to 1923, murder has increased 271 per cent; manslaughter 250 per cent; bigamy 83 per cent, and transportation of liquor 4,504 per cent. This is a great comfort. We had thought it was very much worse than this, but we are glad to have our fears somewhat modified by figures which we should otherwise have considered conservative. These figures, however, are confined to operations within the jurisdiction of the police force of the city of Washington. We wonder to what extent they would be modified if one were to add murders and violations of the law which become effective outside the District of Columbia through the exercise of those who occupy high places but are still immune from the hands of the law.

In the reminiscences of the life of President Eliot, one telling incident which aroused violent emotions at the time it occurred seems to have been conspicuous by its absence. There are many who will recall that two students, members of the two university boat crews which were just then making ready for the annual contest with Yale, had been suspended for a serious violation of the University rules, and thus dropped from their crews almost on the eve of the race. The victory over Yale, until then joyfully and confidently expected, was put in question. An extraordinary excitement took hold of alumni and students, and turned against President Eliot. Then President Roosevelt and First Assistant Secretary of State Bacon, both of them loyal Harvard men, telegraphed to Eliot expressing their astonishment at the severity of the punishment and asking him to modify it so as to permit the men to row. Dr. Eliot telegraphically declined the request, "since the finest sense of honor was the best fruit of college education, and since both men did a dishonorable thing." Incidents of that sort make one realize how small the President of the United States may show himself to be when he loses sight of the finest sense of honor.

As the evolution from Fundamentalism to Modernism takes place, if it does, the adjustment is likely to manifest itself in many other ways than merely theological. How, for instance, does the liberal church of today stand in the matter of what may be called its technique? To what extent and with what success has it summoned to its aid the great field of art, beauty and architecture? Has it developed anything comparable to the discipline of the Roman Church in its education of the young and its recogniton and dramatization of the crises of human life? And finally will it sometime see its way clear to discard its present methods of palliation in social life, and embrace some such reconstructed discipline as is suggested by Mr. Albert Wiggam's formulation of "The New Decalogue of Science."

Sketches

(1) Me First

He came from college filled with idealism. Whether or not college had developed his mind much, or had endowed him with many facts and practical intentions, it had given him idealism and so had paid for itself.

His street, in the little town where he lived, had a block of river frontage which had been used as a dumping ground.

With his new way of looking at all the world, he saw this place clean and tended and planted, a stretching area of greenery and lawn. It seemed to him that everybody on his street should be glad to participate in such a happy undertaking.

The people on his street all passed along that river block every time they went to the bridge.

Full of faith, he called to see them, one by one—the people on his street. To one after another he stated his proposal: That the residents of the street combine to petition the city to raise the road and fill in the ditch, and that a private fund be raised for top soil and for shrubbery and the work of planting.

They all listened, questioned, and replied:

"But that is going to increase the value of the adjoining property!"

"Yes," cried the youth eagerly, delightedly.

"But we're not going to chip in to increase the value of those fellows' property."

"It can't help but increase the value of their property, incidentally, if we lift the roadway and fill the ditch," he said, not understanding.

And with one voice they replied: "That's why we're against it."

He could not believe this. "Do you mean," he said, "that you would give up clearing up that unsightly place just because you'll thereby increase the property value for those men who live beside it—and who will chip in, too?"

"Sure," they said. "Let those fellows do it all."

It was his first lesson in the way that men have built up their point of view about their affairs and those of their fellows. But it was worth something to him.

For now, whenever he finds himself calculating, or

trimming, or wanting to shift responsibility, or being afraid that somebody else would get the best of a situation, or saying "me first" in any of the countless forms used by men—men who would send their children away from the table for any expression of the selfsame sentiment—why, then he recalls the people who live in his street, and what they had replied, with one voice, to the boy who had dared to dream a dream by which somebody else should accidently profit.

(2) Three on the Drive

Eight o'clock in the morning and the North Shore Drive is bright with the bodies of motors. A wine-colored car, beautifully turned out, and by its chauffeur in obvious livery retarded to the slow pace of the lesser cars, has but one occupant. A woman of thirty, as perfectly turned out as the car.

Her face has not beauty alone, but shows that slow fashioning, cell on cell, to which generations have contributed. A face meditative, tender.

She is off for a visit—on the seat beside the driver are two bags, and the smooth black canvas is covering, one is sure, initialed morocco in its turn enclosing silver fittings and exquisite garments.

You know that you could trust shoes, gloves, peacock-beaded bag to be admirable. She makes you conscious of fragrance. She is race and environment and economic ease incarnate.

A bell sounds. A patrol, impatient at even the skimming flight of the cars, is asking to pass, does pass, slips into line just before the wine-bodied car. In the patrol, on the side seats, are two women. They are towards twenty-five, in cheap neat suits, and casual hats; they are gloveless, and they carry worn leather hand-bags. Their faces are still fresh and wholesome, and now their looks are bewildered.

They are talking in absorption, not excitedly, but with thoughtfulness, listening to each other, evidently agreeing. Whatever it is, they cannot make it out.

It is all beyond them. It is unquestionably beyond them to discover just how they came to be here where they are. They do not even see the woman in the wine-bodied car.

She however sees them. Not with aversion or pity, but with something else. With a look widening upon more than the wagon or the woman. A sense of immense escape, of personal evasion of the abyss. She is close to those two, she can see their inert hands, their awkwardly placed feet. One is shaking her head: "No, no, no," as if she were saying no to all of her life. Then the wine-car's chauffeur sees an aisle in the traffic, darts into it, and the two women are forever lost.

And the woman in her car is thinking thankfully and almost tenderly: "There, but for the grace of God, go I!"

"There, but for the grace of God, go I!"

Once another woman put it like this: "What have I done that I should be so protected, so loved, so loaded with comforts, when other women . . ."

And she was conscious of nothing save an added responsibility to spend her money carefully.

"There but for the grace of God, go I!"

That slow fashioning, cell on cell, to which the generations have contributed. Race, environment, economic ease, sacrifices of a thousand ancestors and their workers, of teachers, growers and fashioners of food. All swept up in one complacent phrase:

"There but for the grace of God, go I!"

Is it enough? Complacence, gratitude, responsibility, are these enough? Is it not more than this? How if one were to look on these others and say:

"There go I."

(3) Human Engineering

There are those who say that some day people will be talking about the following, as today they accept gravitation; and that the Polish nobleman, named Korzybski, whose vision it is, will be thought of as is Newton. And yet any ordinary man or woman can understand it, and can guess what it might mean to us:

This man says that man is not an animal. For:

1. Plants have the power to attract chemical substances from the earth and energy from the sun; and they are the "energy binding" or "chemistry binding" class.

2. Animals can do this, and have the added power to move about in space, they are the "space-binders."

3. Man can exercise both these powers, but in addition he lives not as animals in the present only, but by the past and for the future; so men are the "time binders," and it is this power which enables them alone to create civilizations.

What does this signify for us?

For one thing, that just as man can predict for plants and chart and direct their growth; and just as he can chart and direct animals—domesticate and order them—so he can come to understand even himself, can chart and direct and predict his race in exact ways; can show what consequences will follow on such and such purposes and generalizations.

This will start him on a reconstruction of life—life as a problem in *human engineering.*

So far, says the Pole, man has imitated the animals. He has, for example, seen them fight and imposed upon himself fighting. He has learned from physics that "two bodies can not occupy the same space at the same time," and believing himself a space-binder alone, like the animals, he has fought like them, saying that the strongest, most ruthless, survives. But with the time-binder, the same law takes on a different aspect. "Who survives in time? The strongest or the best?"

This is only the A B C of his conception, of which Dr. Cassius J. Keyser, Adrian professor of mathematics at Columbia, says: "It is momentous—it is

new—it is, I believe, destined to light the way in all the cardinal concerns of our human kind."

(4) First Prize

Watch a man taken suddenly by some good fortune, and you have a measuring-rod to his inner self.

He was one of the inconspicuous students at the Art Institute. He was not considered "promising." He had gifts, but they were never spectacular, never arresting, in result.

And far from arresting was his personality. He was quiet, busy and a bit shy. If you had asked any of the students or the faculty to whom he was known, you would almost certainly have heard that he would never get anywhere.

"Good careful work. Excellent draughtsman. But no fire and no distinction! Thirty students here can do as well as he."

It is doubtful whether anyone about the school guessed his power of personality—and that usually means power of something more—until the day on which they told him about the prize.

That day he was working on mural. He was seated on a scaffold high up in the Gothic hall of the Institute. He was laying on great swoops of color with the daring stroke, the perfect balance, which were to become known to them all.

But that day as usual no one was paying any attention to him. He sat up there alone, in the silence of the ceiling, in his task. When someone entered the huge empty room, he did not even look down at the sound of steps.

"Hello?"

"Got some news for you."

"Sure?"

"Sure. Better climb down and hear it."

He laughed at that—the same laugh which, they tell now, he had sometimes given when someone would drop in at his room in off hours, and ask naïvely: "Are you busy tonight?" He never told them he was always busy. He merely looked up with that short laugh or with a good-natured grin, and waited for the question to settle down. This time that he laughed—he added: "If any news wants me to hear it, it's got to get up here."

"All right. Only don't fall off your perch. You've won first prize on your fresco."

For an instant Biddy still peered down, then he turned round on the scaffold and touched his brush to his palette.

"Good—for—me!" said he leisurely.

And his arm resumed its long slow strokes of color on the high wall.

Zona Gale.

Jottings

The Teapot Dome affair is not only a disgrace; it is a nuisance. While we watch the kettle boil, Russian recognition, the Outlawry of War, and other issues fundamental to the peace and order of the world, are forgotten. And just ahead is a presidential election, which will probably swamp everything in the greatest mass of muck that the nation has seen since the Cleveland-Blaine campaign. What a situation—and prospect!

The Modernist in the orthodox churches has been described as "a liberal who sees farther than he has courage to go." This cap fits in many cases.

General Pershing, we are told, is seeking conferences with state governors to the end of making plans which "would result in the swift rebuilding of the state organization under the selective service act . . . *if necessity should ever arise.*" Which means that the necessity *will* arise, if General Pershing has his way! An army officer in time of peace, like other superfluous articles, is likely to be a source of mischief.

We read constant reports of bootleggers being attacked and robbed. This certainly is an outrage. If they can't be arrested, the bootleggers might at least be protected, by the government.

Opinions on the condition of affairs in Europe continue to vary from extreme pessimism to confident optimism. Amid the confusion of testimony, we incline to the judgment pronounced by a distinguished journalist in a recent issue of the *New Republic* (March 19, Part II, page 6).

"One still needs proof," says this observer, "that the entire European structure has not already been damaged beyond hope of repair."

The situation in the Philippines is perfectly simple. We have promised the Filipinos independence. Against the fulfilment of this promise stands American capital invested in and making such large profits from the islands. Which is going to win—a moral obligation or an economic interest?

Evolution has been outlawed in four states—Tennessee, Oklahoma, Florida and North Carolina. Bills of outlawry are "up" in fifteen other states. This is something for liberals to think about.

J. H. H.

Items from a Traveler's Note-Book

Rochester, N. Y., was a city revisited. I had been there several times before, and had spoken, as on this occasion, to the Men's Club of the Jewish Synagogue (Rabbi Wolf). So I was at home with friendly faces and warm hand-clasps.

My next stop, however, at Hamburg, N. Y., was a new experience. This village is located twelve miles out of Buffalo, and has a population of some three thousand souls. Of these, about half are daily commuters into Buffalo, while the rest are divided between workers in the town, and farmers in the near-by countryside. There is one factory for the manufacture of high-grade lenses; but this is specialized work, and employs only a small number of operatives. There are seven churches, including one Catholic—as usual, twice or thrice as many as are needed in a community of this size!

I had come to Hamburg to address the "Village Forum," and was entertained by Mrs. G., a highly intelligent woman, wife and mother of a large family, the person chiefly responsible for the institution. She is in this case the leader indispensable in any democratic undertaking of the kind! At dinner, happily attended by husband and wife, two sons, two daughters, an elegant angora cat, and a friendly dog who was a visitor from a neighboring farm, I was told the story of the forum experiment. It had been started four years before, under the inspiration of Ford Hall, Boston, and had been baptized by the personal presence of George W. Coleman himself. A succession of interesting speakers had been secured—among others, Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, of Cornell; Prof. Roselli, of Vassor, and Scott Nearing—and good audiences gathered. The churches, at first a bit hesitant in some cases, had given good support to the enterprise; my meeting was held in the Methodist Church, with the minister present to give his blessing. Publicity was a problem in the absence of a local newspaper; social events in the town sometimes offered serious competition; speakers were not always easy to engage on the dates desired. But finances were sound, with surplus funds in the bank—a fact unprecedented, I think, in my experience; and the forum as a local institution now firmly established in the goodwill of the citizens.

Nevertheless, a crisis was at hand! Mrs. G.'s right-hand man, who had presided regularly at the forum meetings and helped generally in making and carrying out the plans, had recently left the village. Mrs. G. and her family were going abroad, to remain for an entire year. Where was the new leader, to take hold and carry on the work? Mrs. G. did not know, and was fearful of the future. I suggested the ministers. "I should think," I said, "that one of them would be delighted to direct the forum as a form of public service in the community." But I was told that, while the churches were co-operative, they were jealous of one another, and it would be fatal for the forum to pass into the control of any one of them, even through identification with its minister as a leader. A beautiful commentary on what sectarian Christianity means to society from the standpoint of the general welfare! At the close of the meeting which I addressed, the audience remained to consider the problem of the future, but I had to leave before deliberations were under way. May the leader be found to carry on the good work!

From Hamburg I went to Detroit, where I spent Sunday, preaching in the morning in the Unitarian Church, and speaking in the afternoon at the Open Forum in the auditorium of the Central High School. I never see Detroit without marveling at its growth and beauty. The city has a touch of the European aspect about it, in its spacious squares and wide avenues, its well-placed public buildings, its evidences of city planning. I had never before, however, seen the place so dirty; and after looking at the paper-bestrewn streets and the cluttered alleys, I was not surprised to read of the dens of iniquity being uncovered in a local vice-crusade. Dirt without—and dirt within! One preacher was making the most of the current scandal, printing in the Saturday evening newspapers a huge advertisement lurid with promises of sensational disclosures.

My morning at the Unitarian Church, under the gracious chaperonage of the minister, Dr. Reccord, was made delightful by a large congregation and a cordial response to my sermon on "The Religion of Courage." Cordiality was again in evidence in the afternoon at the Forum, where I talked on "A Way to Get Rid of War." Not unanimously so, however! I could sense some dissent when I said that the Great War was an economic struggle between England and Germany not worth the life of a single soldier, when I declared that in the future we should refuse to heed any call to arms, when I praised the Russian Revolution and expressed my regret that it had not extended farther. One auditor, an elderly gentleman in a clerical collar, arose during the question period, and demanded a chance to be heard. It was a pity that the rules of the Forum did not make this possible! On the whole, however, the audience was with me, especially on the proposition that war is a crime, and should be outlawed.

A dinner at the hotel with Mr. J. F. Wright, founder of the Pathfinders of America, an admirable organization for prison reform and character building, was followed by a flight to the midnight train for Chicago. Here the next morning there was a hectic breakfast with Mr. S. O. Levinson, Col. Raymond Robbins, and Fran Schreiber, with much talk on the Outlawry of War and the political situation in Washington, and a race for the train west. In due season came Cedar Rapids, Iowa, with my beloved friend and comrade, W. W. Argow, minister of the People's Church, on the station platform to meet me. A few hundred miles and a score of hours had brought me into a new climate. Detroit had been fair and sunny—bright blue sky, balmy air, the signs of spring! Cedar Rapids was dark and cold, with six inches of heavy snow upon the ground. That night, as I hurried through the darkness to my train, it seemed as though it were midwinter, with summer months far away. But everybody was happy—much happier than the pilgrim from the East—for March snows are precious boons in this country, mellowing the earth and filling the water-springs.

After an address before the Woman's Club, a short drive about town, and a lovely supper-hour with Argow and his family, came the big event—my visit to the People's Church, made famous by Joseph Fort

Newton. It was decidedly a shock to see a building seating not more than 300 people. I remembered the stories about special trains in the days of the Newton consulship, when people used to come into town for miles around to hear the preacher. I couldn't help wondering how these multitudes got in or, if they got in, where the city-folk found room to worship. It was just a small, plain, ordinary building, after all! But if the place was disappointing, Newton's fame was not! His stamp is indelibly on that countryside. His influence still a part of the atmosphere men breathe. I found it as far west as Omaha, where I sat at luncheon with a group of business men, and found them familiar with Newton and his work. Strange—and beneficent—the radiations of personality!

Here, in this famous pulpit, I talked on the Fundamentalist controversy to a goodly crowd. I was interested in a platform extension over the pulpit, and blazing foot-lights all in place for a dramatic performance a few nights hence. I was interested also in Mr. Argow's success—his fine appeal to the popular mind, and his steadfast building of the community church idea. Newton's ministry is not the only one which is going to be remembered in this town!

From Cedar Rapids on to Omaha—by the night train through the snow! Here at noon-time I was the guest of the Lions Club. As I had never heard of this organization before, I thought that some mistake had been made, and that what I was really going to was Mutt and Jeff's "Lion-Tamers Club." But this was the Lions, not the Tamers, and, for all their roars, a friendly lot! A jazz-band, with a quintet of saxophones, was on hand to discourse music. All rose and sang "America" before eating. Guests from out of town were introduced and applauded. A prize for something or other was awarded—$10 in trade at the Swanson Undertaking Parlors! Two members sang original verses to "Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Shean," with hits on local celebrities. And I spoke! These luncheon clubs throughout the country are getting to be formidable phenomena. Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions—and others still unknown! Omaha now boasts eleven aggregations of the sort, and all flourishing in friendly rivalry. Lions, by the way, is international; a June convention in Omaha is expected to assemble 3,000 delegates.

In the evening came my appointed lecture at the Unitarian Church, under the auspices of the Laymen's League. Here I was interested primarily in three things—the new church, the new minister, and old friends. It was a joy to meet again those whom I had first met when, years ago, I came to Omaha on a three weeks' visit to start the church on a fresh career. And here, in these happy faces and in this exquisitely beautiful building, was what had come of that courageous new endeavor, which I had witnessed and assisted in the beginning. The church edifice still hangs in my memory as a lovely picture—dignified, simple, uplifting, superbly located on a boulevard facing park land, a noble monument to religion in a thriving city. The minister, Mr. Bailey, rescued from the Southern Baptists, is meeting splendidly the challenge of his opportunity. Destined unquestionably for one of the great pulpits of the denomination, his service at Omaha promises to mark an epoch in the church's history.

From Omaha, a long jump to St. Louis via Kansas City—seventeen hours! There I addressed a public meeting under the auspices of the Council of Jewish Women. Then came the trip home on the Pennsylvania as fast as wheels could carry me.

No time in the year could have been more unfavorable for enjoyment of the countryside. The beauty of winter was gone—the beauty of the early spring, except for a few hours in Detroit, was not yet come. The snow in Cedar Rapids and Omaha was a boon to the farmers, but to everybody else, especially the traveler, an inconvenience, an aggravation, and a threat of disease. Except in the area covered by this thick layer of slush, everything was hard and black—the soil, the trees, the houses. It is at such times that the towns and villages, even the farms, along the railroad look their worst. How indiscribably ugly our railway landscapes are, anyhow! Here everything is inside out—you see the linings, or "the kidneys," to quote Heywood Broun's elegant expression—the backs of the houses, the hidden sheds and shacks, the rubbish heaps, the abandoned wagons and other variegated machinery of life, the billboards, the chicken-coops, the manure piles, etc. Out in the country there were some cattle in the fields, a few pigs and sheep, a little plowing. But everything seemed half-frozen, half-awake, uncertain, almost afraid. Life was not yet in the blood. The buds were not out, and the birds had not yet come back.

With little to attract me without, I busied myself mostly in reading. Three books—Arnold Bennett's "Riceyman Steps," an admirable novel, in this author's great style; Anna Louise Strong's new and very important book on Russia, entitled, "The First Time in History"; and Felix Adler's Hibbert lectures, "The Reconstruction of the Spiritual Ideal," a disappointing book after the great "Philosophy;" together with the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, and all the local newspapers en route! These newspapers were read not for pleasure or instruction, but as a matter of deliberate study. And they were depressing enough! Advertisements covering columns and even pages with prodigious type, inane "strips" of comics, syndicated features of empty twaddle, the local murder or suicide or scandal played up with pictures, diagrams and endless details, editorials on the intellectual level of a fresh-water sophomore—the whole thing constituted a mess of silliness, vulgarity and arrant commercialism, which sickened the heart, as it poisoned the mind. Especially significant was it to notice the practical disappearance of foreign news in all the papers (with a few exceptions) west of Buffalo. One would scarcely have known that there was such a place as Europe, or, granted its existence, that anything was going on there of interest or importance. How touching was it, when interviewed in Omaha, to be asked by the reporter to spell the name of the English Premier!

Yet these cities have culture and enlightenment. Percy Granger was announced to give a piano recital in Detroit. I saw Ruth Draper give her highly intelligent impersonations to a packed theatre in Omaha. President Meiklejohn had only recently addressed an audience in Cedar Rapids. The book-shop in the Union Station at Kansas City has made more than one fascinated reader lose his train. St. Louis, like Detroit and Cleveland, has an admirable symphony orchestra. But the newspapers do not live at all on the level of these things. Written by ignorant men, handling material of purely ephemeral and sensational interest, catering to vulgar standards for the sake of quick profits, they constitute a heavy part of the liabilities under which our civilization staggers. Whether our papers

are corrupt, may be a question; that they are unintelligent, silly, and utterly commercial is certain. When one considers the stuff that most people read—the only stuff they ever read—one wonders that the world gets on as well as it does. Yet it *does* get on. At awful cost—but *on*! Assuredly, after all, there is a destiny that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Outlawry of War

[We print herewith two important documents on the Outlawry of War, which should be of great interest to our readers. The first (I) is a letter written by Senator Borah to the Editor of the *Christian Century* in acknowledgment and praise of the remarkable series of editorials printed in that influential journal in advocacy of the outlawry program. Mr. Levinson says of this letter, "It is Borah's strongest statement *re* Outlawry." The second (II) is a letter written by Mr. S. O. Levinson to Mr. J. C. Maxwell Garnett, Secretary of League of Nations Union, in England, and kindly furnished to us by Mr. Levinson for publication in these columns. Carefully prepared as an answer to specific inquiries, this letter is one of the most important statements upon the whole question now extant.—J. H. H.]

I.

UNITED STATES SENATE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Christian Century,
508 S. Dearborn St.,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Mr. Editor:

I sent you a line sometime ago tendering a word of commendation, but I feel that your editorials on militarism and war deserve more than a line of congratulation. Steadily, logically, remorselessly, you are exposing the utter futility of all efforts to end war so long as nations continue to recognize war as a moral and legitimate institution for the settlement of international disputes. The task is a tremendous one. But nothing less than the condemnation through international law and the understanding of nations that war is a crime will mark the first successful movement towards its destruction as an international institution. You had just as well undertake, in my opinion, to build up a code of municipal law around the conceded proposition that the malicious killing of a human being is legitimate as to build up a code of international law of any worth whatever with the concession, expressed or implied, that war is legitimate. If the United States or Great Britain may invade any country that either may see fit to invade, and in doing so violate no provision of international law, then you have a situation in which the whole structure of civilization, its laws, its customs, its practices, are organized and built around the institution of war. Everything must conform to the proposition that war, the indiscriminate killing of human beings, is legitimate. Why not build our international code, our domestic laws, our habits, our thoughts, our moral vision, around the proposition that war is a crime?

How vain have been the efforts for three thousand years to end war. After all, it is not so strange that nothing has been accomplished; indeed, that things grow worse. Every scheme for international peace yet devised and put forth has in the last analysis rested upon the doctrine of force, upon the concession that war is legitimate, that international disputes shall be settled by violence. No scheme or plan has dared to declare what is in the heart and mind of every person, that war is a crime. This is the tribute which all advocates of peace have at last paid to the god of war. Even the plan of William Penn recognized war as the final arbiter of international disputes. The fight to end war has never really had back of it as support the moral and legal condemnation of those who sought to end it. We have been endeavoring to inhibit, or prohibit, that which we dared not denounce as criminal. The whole world has been permitted to look upon war as legal, and so long as legal, moral. What would be thought of a criminal code which would seek to prohibit murder by merely prescribing the kind of weapons which should be used in the killing? Who would expect to control dueling by writing in the criminal code that duels should be fought with a forty-four calibre pistol rather than a forty-five, or with a bowie knife instead of a sword.

It seems to me that the first successful step in the ending of war is to declare it a crime, to array against it the moral and legal condemnation of mankind—to outlaw it—to brand it as a criminal monstrosity. Other steps will follow.

Very sincerely,
(Signed) WILLIAM E. BORAH.

II.

Dear Mr. Garnett:

. . . Before answering your two questions, I would like to state our preliminary *modus operandi*:

If the pending resolution to outlaw war, presented by Senator Borah, is approved by our Senate, it becomes a declaration of American international policy. We then expect it to be responded to by parliamentary bodies of other countries, commencing preferably with our neighbor Canada, including the north European states, England, Russia (as I am told) and some Central and South American countries, and perhaps others. When fifteen or twenty nations have favorably responded to our Senate's declaration, an international conference should be called to consider the outlawing of war. With the momentum of these assenting nations, we conceive it to be difficult for militaristic officials of other countries to check the movement, or to defeat the agenda, with aroused international sentiment fixed upon the open conference. At all events, we will have a show-down as to what nations want to retain the institution of war for the settlement of international disputes, and what nations do not. This would furnish a real test of world opinion.

Concretely as to your two questions:

1. *"How do you propose to outlaw all countries if you do not intend, somehow, to enforce upon a recalcitrant nation your new laws against war?"*

Let us follow the *modus operandi* a bit further. If the above procedure takes place the conference would approve in principle the basic features of the outlawry of war and would call an internatinal convention for the creation and codification of the international laws of peace. The code should have as its fundamental premise the abolition and outlawing of war as a method of settling disputes between nations, and should simplify, improve and democratize international relations.

All civilized nations should have adequate representation in the formation of this code. When completed the code should be submitted to a plebiscite in each nation so that the faith of the people would be pledged behind the riddance of war and the judicial reordering of the world. As the nations will be bound by general treaty, confirmed by referendum vote of the several peoples, it is difficult to visualize a recalcitrant nation such as you suggest. If, however, such a situation should arise, we would have an automatic alliance for peace among the good-faith nations, to cope with the outlaw nation. Of course, if the international court should become corrupt or tyrranical, a revolution might take place, the right to which is inherent and ineradicable. To quote Senator Borah's memorable words: "Revolution is the people's right of self-defense." We cannot go higher than the expressed will of the people in each nation and if the judicial reordering of the world to which the peoples have pledged themselves cannot be maintained, then we conceive it to be impossible to rid the world of war.

But, as I said in my last letter, ours is not a pacifist movement. We do not proceed toward peace along the path of disarmament; we expect disarmament through the riddance of war, rather than riddance of war through disarmament. We propose that each nation, especially until the plan of outlawry vindicates itself, shall retain adequate armament to protect itself. If a nation runs amuck, which is almost inconceivable, the situation will be no worse, but vastly better than it is now. We would then be dealing with a recalcitrant nation that was breaking its treaty with all the nations and violating the international laws to which it and its people were sacredly pledged.

Many important details should be developed at the various conventions for the purpose of safeguarding against untoward possibilities. The main thing, however, is that it will be difficult or impossible to start a war when once we have so re-ordered the world, and international wars have become as unlawful as domestic wars of revolution. These latter cannot be prevented but as they proceed in the teeth of the law, they are rare and are illegal and criminal. For, under domestic law, a Cromwell or a Washington was an actual or potential felon, whereas, under international law, a Napoleon or a Kaiser is a hero and violates no established law. Whether it is desirable to retain and develop remedies of blockade, embargo, boycott and other forms of ostracism (as to which there will be sharp conflict of opinion), should be left to the wisdom of the codifiers. While the remedy of force and enforcement has been the thought of the world for centuries, it really means the retention of the legalized war system and always becomes in the end largely a question of the "heaviest battalions." The world must be appeased by voluntary agreements and treaties and international laws which are not full of holes. While I am emphatically averse to it, the codifiers may conclude that overwhelming power should be put behind the decrees of the international court, available as against your suggested recalcitrant nation. It would certainly be a vast improvement to have the force of armies and navies behind the decrees of a court of justice rather than behind the edicts of the rulers and militarists of the world. But we are trying to eliminate war and any method of enforcing the will of one or a set of nations upon another nation or another set of nations, is war or its physical equivalent. Of course, the right of defense against invasion is inherent and inviolable, but is not war. For, now that dueling is outlawed, if a man defends himself from attack, he is not thereby a duelist.

Your second question is:

1. *"How do you propose to make your proposed 'compulsory jurisdiction' over all the nations effective, if you are not prepared in the last resort to use force and if you do not even propose to substitute for force such world public opinion as can be mobilized by an Association, or Society or League of Nations?"*

This covers similar ground. The "compulsory" jurisdiction we speak of is what was worked out in our own constitutional convention of 1787. Washington, Madison, Hamilton and Ellsworth had this exceedingly difficult problem to solve. There were thirteen of what Hamilton called "Jealous, jarring and perverse states." They had agreed upon an arrangement creating the United States of America that abolished war, that is, that took away from the states the power to engage in war, "unless actually invaded," but they needed a provision for the handling of disputes between the states concerning boundaries, etc., which were then existing and which were certain to ripen into serious controversies. How could jurisdiction be acquired over these sovereign states? How could one sovereign state sue another and bring it into court for the peaceful and judicial settlement of a dispute? It was finally agreed that the states would waive their immunity from court process, and would invade their sovereignty to the extent of conferring upon the United States Supreme Court alone original and exclusive jurisdiction over all the disputes of the states. The early decisions of our Supreme Court show the temporary resistance to this innovation by many states, including Georgia and Massachusetts. The decisions are most interesting and illuminating. Daniel Webster in 1838, in defending the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts against a boundary dispute with the tiny state of Rhode Island, insisted that because the United States Supreme Court had no power to enforce its decree or judgment, it therefore had no jurisdiction to hear the case; and it was further contended that a court without power of enforcing its decrees was a judicial mockery. These propositions were overruled by the court in an elaborate opinion, the court defining jurisdiction as follows:

> Jurisdiction is the power to hear and determine the subject matter in controversy between parties to a suit, to adjudicate or exercise any judicial power over them. (The State of Rhode Island vs. The State of Massachusetts, 37 U. S.—12 Peters—at page 718.)

Some people confuse this extraordinary power of the Federal Supreme Court over the disputes of our sovereign states with the fact that they are all living under one government, with a common congress, a common executive, etc. This reasoning is fallacious. The provision for handling disputes is purely judicial and has absolutely nothing to do with the executive or legislative features. It relates purely and simply to the inevitable disputes that have arisen and will arise between our sovereign states, as they have arisen and will arise between individuals, corporations, municipalities and the nations of the world themselves. These controversies are inevitable and some pacific means of settling them must be provided. Why not try our method which has worked for 136 years without the shedding of a drop of blood? We have had about 87 interstate disputes;

the last decision, 1923, was between Texas and Oklahoma and involved questions of both boundary and oil rights. Why should a different method be provided where the controversy is between New York and Canada (on its immediate north), than is pursued in a similar controversy between New York and Pennsylvania (on its immediate south)? The quotation from John Stuart Mill in my *Forum* article is invaluable. He saw that we had set up the first real international court in the history of the world. All other so-called international courts have been merely arbitral tribunals, including the League court—each one requiring common consent in order to obtain jurisdiction. Just as our sovereign states first prohibited war, "unless actually invaded," before conferring jurisdiction on our Federal Supreme Court, so in any international scheme war must be outlawed first before the several nations will agree to clothe a court with inherent and affirmative jurisdiction over them. For otherwise the risk of involvement in war would be too great to justify the innovation. Great efforts have been made and are being made to induce the United States to co-operate with the other nations to prevent war. But neither mere co-operation nor conference will prevent war. They may prevent some wars but the world cannot stand even one more war. The nineteenth century thought it had discovered the remedy for war in its development of the practice of arbitration. And it really seemed so. For from 1820 to 1840 there were nine successful cases of international arbitration; from 1840 to 1860 there were thirty such arbitrations; from 1860 to 1880 there were forty-four, and from 1880 to 1900 there were ninety *casus belli* arbitrated. Then followed the Hague Conferences which were based on the theory and success of arbitration. But arbitration, though a splendid development that should be retained and used, is not enough. Indeed it cannot be relied on either to prevent war or even to moderate its severities. The recognition of the right solution of the war problem, as worked out by the United States as to its own sovereign units, might be a long stride toward inducing the United States to join in a real effort to rid the world of the curse of war. We have done it here; we have solved the problem for forty-eight sovereign states. Why not try it for the world? It is sometimes said in opposition to this that our Civil War came despite our constitutional safeguards. The answers to this contention are many:

(a) The question was purely a domestic one and the rebellion was unlawful and criminal and constituted high treason against the government. (This is the legal status we would put international war into.)

(b) The Civil War was not a controversy between two or more of our sovereign states; it was an attempt to defy and break up the union of the United States. For if one state could secede, all the others could do the same, and there would be no "United" States. The indissolubility of the union was involved and the contest was between a rebellious state (afterwards joined by others) and the Federal Government. As you Englishmen so often pointed out during the Irish rebellion, your situation was similar to our Civil War.

(c) The question of slavery ought to have been settled (as it had been in your country) when the constitution was adopted. But this vital question was left unsolved and it was almost inevitable that an acute problem of that kind would lead to serious trouble. Many of the organizers of the United States in 1787 themselves owned slaves and the question was postponed in order really to create the United States, because it was feared that this slave problem, if injected into the proceedings, would have destroyed all hope of a federal union.

Now, as to utilizing "such world public opinion as can be mobilized by an Association or Society or League of Nations": There is no objection; on the contrary there is every reason why a properly formed league, association or society of nations would be invaluable in connection with the outlawing of war. But if in any league the war system is to be retained and war between nations is still to be recognized as available, we must all prepare for war and adequate force must be always at hand to meet war with war. This offers no relief from taxation and no protection from the impending crash of civilization.

Therefore the league, society or association should be in no sense an alliance whose main function is to execute the treaty of Versailles or to form a preponderance of power among the nations. It should be a conciliatory body to consider, mediate and adjust in a friendly and non-judicial way, the disputes among the nations; and to continue to carry out and multiply vast humanitarian activities. The international court should have wholly independent powers and should be the final resort of disputant nations where the conciliatory body, such as the league, has been unable to adjust the controversy. No court can have judicial power or the respect of the nations that is dependent upon any other entity for its jurisdiction or its activities. This is the Anglo-Saxon theory of civilization. Therefore, if the League is to be retained, the covenant would practically have to be rewritten because the thread of war runs through the fabric of the whole instrument—its warp and its woof. But this would not be a hard task. Once the major premise of outlawing war is adopted it would be relatively easy to eliminate all conflicting clauses. With authoritative judicial power in the background, the League would become a great organ of conciliatory conference and of effective mediation. So long as resort to war is available and the duty to arbitrate is optional, no substantial headway for security and peace can be made.

Moreover, there is the same reason why international law should define international crimes that domestic laws have defined domestic crimes. The idea that governments are above all law and ethics and sense of justice is a disgrace to the Christian world and modern civilization. Governments, in fact, ought to be more ethical, more just and more humane than individuals. There is, therefore, every reason why the nation should be bound by a comprehensive and just code of laws. Our proposed "compulsory jurisdiction" means only the kind of jurisdiction that is exercised by our Federal Supreme Court over our sovereign states. Thus in the case referred to, Rhode Island filed a petition in our Supreme Court against Massachusetts. The court issued a summons directed to Massachusetts, which it had the power to do. Thereupon Massachusetts could either come in and answer the petition or stay out and not be heard. In the latter event, the court would proceed *ex parte* as by default, and hear the evidence and arguments offered by Rhode Island and decree accordingly. But our states have not staid out and Massachusetts did not stay out. If a state or nation defies the jurisdiction of a competent court and refuses to submit its case, the whole power of public opinion will

automatically mobilize against it. You see, therefore, that our compulsory jurisdiction does not involve the use of force. It means only that the nations have agreed to the jurisdiction of a court, have provided it with a binding code of laws, and have clothed it with power to summon in the nations and to hear their petitions and defenses. This procedure has worked perfectly in this country. Why not try it for the world?

I have written thus at length to try to give you, as fully as possible, our points of view. I am sure that outlawing war, when understood, should be adopted as the common objective of all advocates of peace. We believe that with war made a crime and removed from the pathway of civilization, all other reforms and humane activities will be accelerated and made the easier. We also believe that unless the practice of wars is condemned by civilization as criminal and disreputable our profession of faith will be hypocritical and futile.

Sincerely yours,
S. O. LEVINSON, *Chairman.*

J. C. Maxwell Garnett, Esq.,
Secretary, League of Nations Union,
15, *Grosvenor Crescent,*
London, S.W. 1, *England.*

Gandhi's Letter on His Release from Prison

Sassoon Hospital, Poona, 7th February, 1924.

My dear friend and brother,

I send you as President of the Congress a few words which I know our countrymen expect from me on my sudden release. I am sorry that the Government have prematurely released me on account of my illness. Such a release can bring me no joy for I hold that the illness of a prisoner affords no ground for his release.

I would be guilty of ungratefulness if I did not tell you and through you the whole public that both the gaol and the hospital authorities have been all attention during my illness. Col. Murray, the Superintendent of the Yeravda Prison, as soon as he suspected that my illness was at all serious, invited Col. Maddock to assist him and I am sure that the promptest measures were taken by him to secure for me the best treatment possible. I could not have been removed to the David and Jacob Sassoon Hospitals a moment earlier. Col. Maddock and his staff have treated me with the utmost attention and kindness. I may not omit the nurses who have surrounded me with sisterly care. Though it is now open to me to leave this hospital, knowing that I can get no better treatment anywhere else, with Col. Maddock's kind permission, I have decided to remain under his care till the wound is healed and no further medical treatment is necessary.

The public will easily understand that for sometime to come I shall be quite unfit for active work and those who are interested in my speedy return to active life will hasten it by postponing their natural desire to see me. I am unfit and shall be so for some weeks perhaps to see a number of visitors. I shall better appreciate the affection of friends if they will devote greater time and attention to such national work as they may be engaged in and especially to handspinning.

My release has brought me no relief. Whereas before release I was free from responsibility save that of conforming to gaol discipline and trying to qualify myself for more efficient service, I am now overwhelmed with a sense of responsibility I am ill-fitted to discharge. Telegrams of congratulations have been pouring in upon me. They have but added to the many proofs I have received of the affection of our countrymen for me. It naturally pleases and comforts me. Many telegrams however betray hopes of results from my service which stagger me. The thought of my utter incapacity to cope with the work before me humbles my pride.

Though I know very little of the present situation in the country I know sufficient to enable me to see that perplexing as the national problems were at the time of the Bardoli resolutions they are far more perplexing to-day. It is clear that without unity between Hindus, Mahommedans, Sikhs, Parsis and Christians and other Indians all talk of Swaraj is idle. This unity which I fondly believed in 1922 had been nearly achieved has so far as Hindus and Mussalmans are concerned, I observe, suffered a severe check. Mutual trust has given place to distrust. An indissoluble bond between the various communities must be established if we are to win freedom. If the thanksgiving of the nation over my release be turned into a solid unity between the communities that will restore me to health far quicker than any medical treatment or rest cure. When I heard in the gaol of the tension between Hindus and Mussalmans in certain places my heart sank within me. The rest I am advised to have will be no rest with the burden of disunion preying upon me. I ask all those who cherish love towards me to utilize it in furtherance of the union we all desire. I know that the task is difficult. But nothing is difficult if we have a living faith in God. Let us realize our own weakness and approach him and he will surely help. It is weakness which breeds fear and fear breeds distrust. Let us both shed our fear, but I know that even if one of us will cease to fear we shall cease to quarrel. Nay, I say that your tenure of office will be judged solely by what you can do in the cause of union. I know that we love each other as brothers. I ask you, therefore, to share my anxiety and help me to go through the period of illness with a lighter heart.

If we could but visualize the growing pauperism of the land and realize that the spinning wheel is the only remedy for the disease, the wheel will leave us little leisure for fighting. I had during the last two years ample time and solitude for hard thinking. It made me a firmer believer than ever in the efficacy of the Bardoli program and therefore in the unity between the races, the charkha, the removal of untouchability and the application of non-violence in thought, word and deed to our methods as indispensable for Swaraj. If we faithfully and fully carry out this program we need never resort to civil disobedience and I should hope that it will never be necessary but I must state that my thinking prayerfully and in solitude has not weakened my belief in the efficacy and righteousness of civil disobedience. I hold it, as never before, to be a man's or a nation's right and duty when its vital being is in jeopardy. I am convinced that it is attended with less danger than war and whilst the former when successful benefits both the resister and the wrong doer the latter harms both the victor and the vanquished.

You will not expect me to express any opinion on

the vexed question of return by Congressmen to the Legislative Councils and the Assembly. Though I have not in any way altered my opinion about the boycott of Councils, Law Courts and Government Schools I have no data for coming to a judgment upon the alterations made at Delhi and I do not propose to express any opinion until I have had the opportunity of discussing the question with our illustrious countrymen who have felt called upon in the interest of the country to advise removal of the boycott of legislative bodies.

In conclusion may I, through you, thank all the very numerous senders of congratulatory messages. It is not possible for me personally to acknowledge each message. It has gladdened my heart to see among the messages many from our Moderate friends. I have, and non-co-operators can have, no quarrel with them. They too are well-wishers of their country and serve to the best of their lights. If we consider them to be in the wrong we can hope to win them over only by friendliness and patient reasoning, never by abusing. Indeed we want to regard Englishmen too as our friends and not misunderstand them by treating them as our enemies. And if we are to-day engaged in a struggle against the British Government it is against the system for which it stands and not against Englishmen who are administering the system. I know that many of us have failed to understand and always bear in mind the distinction and in so far as we have failed we have harmed our cause.

I am,
Your sincere friend and brother,
(Signed) M. K. GANDHI.

To Maulana Mahomed Ali, President of the Indian National Congress.

CORRESPONDENCE

A LETTER FROM JAPAN.

The boat trip was a fine experience. Most of the days were spent in deck sports playing games. The games especially appealed to the boys for they were allowed to enter all the sports. Three evenings during the trip we had movies which of course the children enjoyed. The movies were mostly junk. One especially with a villain, so frightened Ruth that she worried for the next few days as to whether the man who had killed a little girl during the movie would not catch her. Her one hope was that the bad man could not swim out in the ocean as far as we were and so could not hurt her.

The passengers on the boat were a fine cross section of American life and were an interesting group. There were a lot of young people on their way to the Orient for pleasure, business and religious work. It was interesting to watch how some of the young people lost out during the trip. It is hard to start on high and travel at that speed all the way across. The real self finally shows itself before the 12 days are over.

Captain Robert Dollar made a fine impression on board and he is a man worth knowing. As I was stung to lead the Sunday Services I got him on the second Sunday to be one of the speakers. As all the other speakers were sick on account of the storm he took all the time and made a very interesting talk. He stressed the value of daily Bible reading. He urged the young men going out to the Orient for business to stand for Christianity, to work hard, and that they would greatly prosper. He pitied the idle rich who had not learned how to work and do something worth while with their time and money. He himself has made a statement that in all his dealings in China he does not expect to take any money out but to keep it all in the country. His life was of greater interest than his words. As a man of 81 he is starting out on a world trip for the purpose of fulfilling his life dream, i. e., establishing an American steamship line that will regularly encircle the globe. He puts to shame the man who thinks of retirement at 60 or 70. He moves rapidly for he says that he has only 20 more years to live and so must hurry. Another interesting man whom I met on the boat was Father Lane. He was going out to China for the first time as the business manager of the Catholic Missions in China. I hadn't realized before that the Catholic Missions had developed on such a large scale. He was very liberal in his thinking along economic lines and very friendly in his whole attitude toward life. Father Lane was kind enough to suggest that I have my baggage in Hong Kong sent to the Catholic warehouse to wait for my arrival. So the Y. M. C. A. baggage is calmly resting in the arms of the Catholic Church. . .

The captain's dinner was a time of great jollification and the children especially got a great kick out of throwing confetti and paper at the others in the dining room. The "Jackson" had ten or twelve automobiles on board. There has been a great shipment of cars into Japan since the earthquake because the Japanese government has taken all tax and duty off for a year following the quake.

Yokohama is a wreck. Words cannot describe the destruction and those that have been there for several months notice great improvement. Any business now is being done in shacks built out of wood and galvanized tin. The main building in the town that seems the least damaged is the Y. M. C. A.; the lower two floors were burned out but the third floor was untouched. Street cars are again running, although many of the cars are temporary open-air cars. Many of the old cars were of course destroyed. Man persists in spite of surroundings and as I saw the Japanese persistently without any comment going ahead to build up I was impressed by their spirit.

The impression that I gain in Europe was reimpressed on my mind in Yokohama, i. e., that given a chance the common man will go ahead and build and that he is more interested in building than destroying. The things that often stand in his way are the elements and his own government.

We left Yokohama after a pleasant ride in rickshaws and took the train for Tokyo. All along we saw the results of the quake. Took a taxi from the Tokyo station to the compound of the Y. M. C. A. We had no sooner gotten out of the taxi and started to go up the steps when everything started to shake and rock. The houses looked as though they were trees blowing in the wind. Mr. Phelps and a number of the Japanese came running out of the house. It was the worst shake since the big one and in Tokyo there were enough slight shakes to keep one in constant remembrance that the ground beneath you was quite insecure. Here again, however, as in Yokohama, the spirit of the people was impressive and the upbuilding of the city was under way. The earthquake showed one of the advantages of the family system as it exists in the Orient. The thousands of people who were burnt out of their homes were quickly absorbed back in the small villages from which they had come.

Although it is very difficult to judge the Japanese hastily I was impressed by the genuine interest and ability and also their desire to handle their own affairs in their own way. One of the difficulties of the Y. M. C. A. is that it has developed in America as the result of the needs in America, has gradually changed into a movement and then into an institution and that now the attempt is being made to transpose an institution into a civilization that at present has not a conscious need for it. . .

I spoke to the boys at the Kwanto Gakuin School. This group used to have their school in Yokohama but their buildings were totally destroyed so that they were meeting in the afternoons at a girls' school. They met in a large room that was cold. The weather was fierce. Rain poured down in buckets and as I had a pair of paper shoes my feet were soaked. After I talked one of the older boys made a very fine speech in English, thanking me and requesting that I take the greetings of the boys from Japan to the rest of the boys of the world and tell them they are anxious for friendly relations.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 25

After lunch Patterson and I went to visit some of the work that was being done among the boys who had been burnt out of their homes. Temporary barracks had been built and the people were living apparently in comfort. I was impressed by the cleanliness of the people and the way they kept in order their homes even under the greatest of difficulties. The city had started a library and a story hour for the children so that they could keep on with their studies. There is more of street

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE OTHER FRANCE.

We print below the text of an appeal published at Christmas time by Romain Rolland to the French people:

"In the face of affliction there are no longer either conquerors or vanquished.

"One of the holiest traditions of our people is that of uncovering before passing death, regardless of what that life may have been. And the honor of all who bend toward human suffering that they may diminish it—doctors, nurses, sisters of charity—is to give to those who suffer, no matter who they may be, the same measure of devotion.

"Strengthened by these sacred sentiments, we stand forth and say to France:

"The German people are dying of hunger. Thousands of innocent are cruelly expiating the consequences of the scourge of war for which they are responsible only through the ambitions, greed, and egotism of their ruling classes.

"At Berlin, at Leipzig, at Freiburg, when in late October bread was costing from seven to ten thousands of millions of marks, the monthly salary of a brain-worker failed to come within one one-hundredth of that figure. Professors, doctors, engineers, lawyers are selling their books and the instruments with which they labor that they may purchase bread. Students of certain universities are begging in troops along the highways and hedges. At Berlin 70 per cent of the children go to school without their breakfast, a great many of them have nothing but hot soup every second day. Thousands of families, emaciated by privation, are in slow agony. The pangs of cold are added to those of hunger. A winter of dreadful famine and epidemics has begun.

"The chivalrous France of former days, of whose power Hugo was the last minstrel, stretches forth her hand to the conquered on the fields of battle and staunches his wounds. It is now four years since, as they say, the war ended; the new life of the earth has reclothed the battlefields with fecund oblivion of its harvests. But the vanquished lies sick unto death and perishes without assistance.

"We appeal to all those of our race, without distinction of party or belief. Many passions, alas, disunite the French But let us render justice to one another. We have this one thing in common: that we all respect our France, that we all have faith in her moral nobility, and that we are all anxious to safeguard it. Let us show this then to the world. Let us affirm that there is no room in the heart of the French for a debasing hatred or for a yet more vile indifference to the misery of men, but that victorious France keeps the field of pity.

"One tests his victory only by the greatness of his soul. And the loftiest power is the power of generosity. We invite the French to stretch forth the hand of succor to the people they fought. We are opening a subscription for the wretched in Germany, and place upon the list, as a beginning, our own names.

"ROMAIN ROLLAND."

"Christmas, 1923.

OF MAKING ONE'S SELF BEAUTIFUL

by

WILLIAM C. GANNETT

New Edition

Soon to be issued by

THE STRATFORD COMPANY, BOSTON

Grace, Charm, Humor, characterize the five chapters of this book which point to the sources of Soul Culture—

Of Faces and Their Making
Culture Without College
The Thorn Bearer
A Recipe for Good Cheer
The House Beautiful

Price $1.25

Send in your order now to

MISS JULIA R. BREWINGTON
111 Meigs St., Rochester, N. Y.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 **120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO**

trading in Japan than in America. One comes to realize that people are living closer to the line of existence in these older countries.

I had not appreciated before the freedom there is in a country where there are still great tracts of land which need developing. In a country like Japan, where the population is so large for the amount of land, one has to stay where he is and eke out a living as best he can. . . Visited Judge Mitsui at the Juvenile Court. The building was cold. Had our tea. Then chatted for a time on crime among children. Movies seemed to him to be one of the worst influences on the youth. The main reason for it as he said was: Japanese boys do not associate with girls at all in their schools after the 3rd grade in the primary. The result is that when they see American films with so much familiarity between the sexes the results are bad. The main trouble at present with the boys that come before him is stealing. He seemed to feel that in this there was little difference among boys . . . as to whether they were from Christian homes or not. It is interesting that most of the men, however, that have led in social welfare movements have been Christian men; at least their number is out of proportion to the number of Christians there are in the country.

Watched one of the judges perform. I have never been where there was a more friendly relationship between the judge and the boy. The judge seemed to know more about the boy than the boy himself. The boy did not know how old he was but the judge was able to tell, and then wrote down on a piece of paper the boy's age and told him to remember it next time. The judge was very clever in the way he developed the boy's interests, the effects of the movies, the kind of books he liked and what he did with his time. The court now has someone studying in America and hopes to introduce the best things as worked out in America into Japan. The Japanese are not afraid to learn from the successes and mistakes of others. They have, however, real ideas of their own and often better than the teacher. TRACY STRONG.

THE LIBERAL FAITH NOT CONTROVERSIAL

Editor of UNITY:

I want to hasten to express my appreciation of the article "Implications on the Fundamentalist and Modernist Controversy" in UNITY of March 13. I have felt all the while that controversial debates and discussions are foreign to the genius of our liberal faith. The author of this message to religious liberals has made an excellent presentation of the point of view to which I am glad to give my full assent.

When C. W. Reese was here a few weeks ago he said there would probably be a meeting of the National Association of Religious Liberals in New York during April. If so, I want to come.

Yours truly,
HARRY FOSTER BURNS.

Baltimore, Md., March 19, 1924.

THE SICKLE

Take your sickle from the rafter
Of the low, the pole-built shed;
Take your sickle, follow after
Winds that bow the wheats' ripe head!
There is music in your mowing,
There is laughter in the breeze;
God has meant it—reaping, sowing—
Work for errant hands like these!

All of nature is unresting—
Mote by mote the high hills fall;
In the bough the birds are nesting
And the ivies fret the wall!
God is work and God is labor—
See the stars His flame has lit;
Toil to us is friend and neighbor
Kindly, kingly every whit!

LESLIE CLARE MANCHESTER.

BIRTHDAYS IN APRIL OF POLITICAL PRISONERS.

Birthdays in April of Political Prisoners confined in American "State" Prisons are announced by the Workers' National Prison Comfort Club, 2923 Chestnut St., Milwaukee, Wisconsin, as follows:

At San Quentin Prison, San Quentin, California—April 5, Jim Martin, No. 37636; April 8, Fred Bamman, No. 38531; April 25, Chas. Crowley, No. 38534.

At Walla Walla, Washington, Box 520—April 27, B. Bland, No. 9411.

*At North Side Station, Pittsburgh, Pa., B-59, Box A-*11387—April 25, Jos. Martinovich.

At Norfolk County Jail, Dedham, Mass., c/o Norfolk County Sheriff—April 23, Niccola Sacco.

Cora Meyer, National Secretary, invites friends and sympathizers to send birthday cards and letters (money is advisable for gifts) to these Political Prisoners. Books and publications must be sent directly from the publishers.

Francis E. McClennegen, from San Quentin, writes: "Thanks to everybody whose cards and letters went to make my birthday a day to be remembered.

Introducing to you

ORIENT

An International Magazine of Art and Culture.
Illustrated with Oriental Art Pictures and Plates.

A Journal of World-Fellowship and Better Understanding between the Orient and the Occident.
Orient opens the portals that lead you to the ORIENTAL treasures in art, literature and culture.
Published Bi-monthly. Subscription $3.00 a year.
50 cents a copy
Announcing the $1000 ANNUAL ORIENT PRIZE for International Essay Contest in the 1924 Orient ANNUAL just out.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER
(Good for Thirty Days only)

ORIENT MAGAZINE, 132 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
Enclosed $1.00 please send me copy of 1924 ORIENT ANNUAL which entitles me to two following issues of Orient MAGAZINE, by which time I should be able to decide if I would like to continue to be a subscriber.

Name .....
Dated ..... Address .....

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

A Better Food

Milk is better food than meat—yet it costs much less.

Drink BOWMAN'S MILK—a quart a day. Notice how much better you feel.

BOWMAN DAIRY Company

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS
3913 Cottage Grove
Tel., Atlantic 1876

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

IN APRIL

Comes Easter as the signal for introducing your clothes of a new season. Spring demands an appropriate wardrobe—and there is no greater economy to be practiced than the use of our service which so expertly cleanses and freshens each previously worn garment that you send us.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 : : : : : ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORK
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read UNITY